

proud of their service, their commitment, and the immense sacrifices they made and continue to make on behalf of our country.

The T-Bolts served honorably in defense of a grateful nation, and I am pleased today to recognize the heroic members of the 389th for their valorous service while deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

I am reminded of the core values of the Air Force: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all you do. There is no better example than the airmen of the 389th Expeditionary Fighter Squadron. With consummate bravery and boldness, the T-Bolts honor every American through a spirit of dedication and a sense of duty to defend a cause larger than one's self. For their efforts, we and future generations are forever indebted and eternally grateful.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I apologize to the Chair. I had a misunderstanding as to where we were, and I only wanted to try to get the point across, which I think I failed to do, regarding the cost of these regulations.

I think I used as an example the five—I mentioned, actually, six when you consider hydraulic fracturing also as one of the regulations. By far, the one that is the most expensive is the regulation that would be for the greenhouse gases. I think we have pretty much established the cost to do a cap-and-trade bill and the range being from \$300 billion to \$400 billion. The quotes I used, which I won't repeat now, were from Administrator Jackson and Senator KERRY and others stating that doing it through regulation would be far more expensive. So I think we need to be looking at it in terms of about \$400 billion a year. This would be a tax on the American people. This would be the cost to our GDP.

I remember back in 1993 when we had the Clinton-Gore tax increase. It was the largest one in four decades at that time. It was an increase in the death tax, an increase in marginal rates, an increase in capital gains—an increase in almost all taxes—and it was a \$30 billion tax increase. What we are talking about here is a tax increase that is 10 times that great—10 times. We are using the figure now of \$400 billion because we know that through regulation, it will cost more.

Again, I go back and repeat the quote we had from Administrator Jackson of the EPA, who said in response to my

question, live in our committee, if we were to pass legislation—at that time, I think it was the Waxman-Markey bill, although it doesn't really matter because cap and trade is cap and trade—would that reduce overall emissions, and she said no because it would only apply to the United States.

I would carry it one step further. If we were to pass or do anything through regulation here, all it will do is cause our manufacturing base to go out and find the energy necessary to operate. And where do they go? They go to places such as China, India, and Mexico—places that have almost no emission standards. So if there is a pollution problem, it becomes much greater, not less, in terms of overall emissions.

Another situation I often talk about is the time before I left to go to the Copenhagen United Nations event, where they were going to try to convince the rest of the world that we were going to pass legislation that would be cap and trade and impose this tax on the American people.

In a committee hearing, I said to Administrator Jackson: I have a feeling that as soon as I leave town, you are going to have an endangerment finding.

Sure enough, that is what happened. I said: When you have an endangerment finding, it has to be based on science. So what science would you be using?

She said: By and large, it would be the science developed by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Ironically, right after that, climategate came up and really destroyed the legitimacy of the IPCC.

I have read some of the quotes that were given by different people when they talked about climategate. One of them is a British writer George Monbiot, who is known for his environmental and political activism, and he is on the other side of this. He writes a weekly column for the Guardian. He said:

Pretending that this isn't a real crisis isn't going to make it go away.

Here, he is referring to climategate and the fact that they were cooking the science.

Nor is an attempt to justify the emails with technicalities.

Again talking about the participants in IPCC.

We'll be able to get past this only by grasping reality, apologizing where appropriate and demonstrating that it cannot happen again.

I also mentioned the Daily Telegraph in the UK. Quoting from it:

This scandal could well be the greatest in modern science.

Then the Atlantic Magazine, which generally is editorializing the other side of this issue, said:

The closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

That was the loss of credibility of the whole idea of the science that was put together by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at the United Nations. But to make it even worse, we requested that the inspector general do a study and report back as to the science and how the science was developed by the IPCC and whether it followed the guidelines that were necessary. They came back just 1 week ago with a report that says the EPA has failed to follow the responsible guidelines. In fact, even before the scope of the study was finalized today, the EPA was already collecting data samples at the undisclosed fracking sites, so they are going in now to using the same type of flawed science and going after other parts of their agenda. In this case, it would be hydraulic fracturing, which I mentioned just a few minutes ago, is an attempt to stop our ability to develop our own resources.

In the course of this overregulation, I think we have to keep in mind and to keep talking about these six greatest and most costly regulatory problems that we have out there and how much it is going to cost the American people. Again, the one that is the most serious right now is trying to regulate and do a cap-and-trade through the regulations as opposed to doing it through legislation.

We are going to keep talking about that. It is not going to go away. People think time will make people forget. But we don't forget something of that magnitude.

I did a calculation in my State of Oklahoma; as I always do, I get the number of families who file a tax return each year. When something comes along that will cost something, I do the calculation and I do the math and then I go back to the American people and say: Get ready. This is what it is going to cost.

If we were to have passed any of the bills that were like the Kyoto Protocol, and the last one being the Waxman-Markey bill, the cost would have been at least \$300 billion. If we take that annual cost, that would cost my tax-paying families in Oklahoma in excess of \$3,000 a family, and they get nothing for it.

We can do an awful lot of talking about the deficits and the spending of this administration. Let's don't overlook perhaps the most expensive thing to the American people; that is, the overregulation that makes us non-competitive with the rest of the world.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

#### PUBLIC DEFENDER JOHN J. HARDIMAN

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to John Hardiman, public defender for the State of Rhode Island, who passed away several days ago.

John was, frankly, the finest public servant I have ever seen in my entire

career, as a soldier, as an elected official. I have never encountered anyone with the dedication, decency, and the determination of John Hardiman. He literally devoted his life to the office of public defender in the State of Rhode Island.

He graduated from law school in 1982. He started as a staff attorney there, worked his way up to the head of trial division, and then became the public defender for the entire State of Rhode Island.

His life was devoted to the law. Quietly, persistently, with diligence, dedication, and decency, he sought to do justice—justice not to the powerful or privileged but for the powerless. Indeed, in many cases, his clients were not only notorious; they were infamous. But John knew the test of our ideals, the test of our legal system, and of our constitutional form of government was that the laws would not simply protect the powerful and privileged, but that they protect all Americans.

Above the entrance of the U.S. Supreme Court are the words “Equal Justice Under Law.” For many people, even lawyers, those are just words. For John Hardiman, it was his life’s vocation, and he made real those words in the lives of every Rhode Islander.

John was a tenacious advocate, but he was always a remarkably modest and decent man. His legal skills rested on a foundation of unimpeachable integrity and decency. He dedicated his life to serving others. In that advocacy and vocation, he was following the example of his father, Dr. James Hardiman, and his mother. They left John a shining example of compassion and concern, a generous spirit, and a humble heart. All his brothers and sisters follow that same example as they, too, in their lives served others.

I had the privilege of growing up with John. He was one of the little kids in school, about 5 years younger, but he always had the reputation—entirely justified—of being a good kid. Where I come from, being a good kid was the highest form of praise. That good kid turned out to be an extraordinary man, advocate, and public servant. This is a poignant moment for me because I recall the many times I saw him throughout his life and my life, as a young student in grammar school, as an athlete similar to his brothers, as a lawyer, as a public defender, as a public servant. He was someone whom you were always glad to see, and those types of individuals are rare and precious, indeed.

John’s passing diminishes all of us, especially his family. But his life has touched the lives of every Rhode Islander. Many will never recognize what he has done. But in standing for justice and for the rule of law and for the rights of those who are in the shadows, he stood for all of us, nobly, decently, with a proud spirit but a gentle spirit also. We have all been diminished, but what he has done for us has made us stronger and better and more ready to

go on to take up his work. His example will sustain us and inspire us as we go forward, as we try to finish his noble work.

I wish to especially extend my condolences to his children, Elizabeth and Emmett, and to all his family. Rhode Island has lost an extraordinary public servant, an extraordinary gentleman. But we are better for having known him, we are better for having him serve us so well, so courageously, so decently.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUPERCOMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, there has been a lot of discussion in the Senate, in the House, and in the media about what the supercommittee is doing and what they should be doing. The American people understand their responsibility in terms of trying to reduce our national debt and our deficit is difficult. I wish them the best of luck in coming up with a solution.

My hope, simply stated, is that the supercommittee will do what the American people want them to do. The American people, through demonstrations all over this country and in poll after poll, have made it pretty clear what they want to see happen. The American people are becoming more and more aware that there is something very wrong in this country when we have the most unequal distribution of income and wealth of any major country on Earth; when the top 1 percent earns more income than the bottom 50 percent; when in a recent 25-year period, 80 percent of all new income went to the top 1 percent; and when the gap between the very rich and everybody else is wider today than it has ever been since 1928, the year before the Great Depression.

If anyone thinks distribution of income in this country is unfair, then they should look at distribution of wealth, which is much more unfair. Today the wealthiest 400 Americans own more wealth than the bottom half of America, 150 million people—400 people, 150 million Americans. That unbelievable inequality in terms of wealth, in my view, is not only morally wrong, it is very bad economics, and it is not sustainable.

When the supercommittee deliberates as to where they should go, I think one direction is very clear. The American people of all political spectrums have made their point of view known very strongly on this issue. Whether Democrat, Independent, or

Republican, poll after poll shows when the wealthiest people in this country are becoming wealthier; when, as Warren Buffett reminds us, their effective tax rate—i.e. real tax rate—is the lowest it has been in decades; yes, the wealthiest people in this country are going to have to pay more in taxes to enable us to go forward on deficit reduction.

So any serious plan brought forth by the supercommittee must ask the wealthiest people in this country to pay more in taxes. Furthermore, as I think everybody knows, we have corporation after corporation that benefits from huge tax loopholes.

A study just came out today that shows one out of four major corporations pays nothing in taxes. Recently, there are examples that major corporations made billions of dollars in profit and not only paid nothing in taxes but got rebates from the IRS. Many of these corporations stash their profits in tax havens in the Cayman Islands and elsewhere to avoid U.S. taxes.

I think the American people are very clear; if we are going to go forward with deficit reduction, large corporations are also going to have to start paying their fair share of taxes. This is across the political spectrum.

I hope the supercommittee is hearing and understands that any agreement must contain significant revenue from the wealthiest people in this country and from the largest corporations.

Furthermore, at a time when military spending has tripled since 1997, I hope as part of their agreement that the supercommittee takes a hard look at our defense budget and asks whether it is necessary that the United States of America spends more on defense than the entire rest of the world combined.

Those are some of the areas I hope the supercommittee will explore: asking the wealthy to start paying their fair share of taxes, ending tax loopholes for large corporations, and taking a hard look at military spending which has tripled since 1997.

Then there is another area the supercommittee must also look at; that is, to understand that in the midst of the worst recession since the Great Depression, a recession caused by the greed and recklessness and illegal behavior on Wall Street, the supercommittee must not cut Social Security, cut Medicare, or cut Medicaid. Social Security is the most successful Federal program in the history of our country. It has a \$2.5 trillion surplus. It can pay out all benefits for the next 25 years because it is funded by the payroll tax. It has not contributed one nickel to our deficit. The supercommittee must not cut Social Security.

Madam President, 50 million Americans have no health insurance and many others are underinsured. According to a study at Harvard University, 45,000 Americans die each year because they do not get to the doctor when they should. Under those conditions it